REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 were rejected by the Examiner in the Final Office Action dated September 2, 2008. A request for continued examination accompanies this Response.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,856,787 to Itkis et al. ("Itkis"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,762,552 to Vuong et al. ("Vuong").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itkis, and Vuong as applied to claims 1-13 and 15-20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,621,814 to Stepan et al. ("Stepan").

Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan, fails to teach the claim 1 limitation of "a single processor configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal."

In Itkis each networked game device has its own microprocessor 10 for executing code and presenting games at the game terminal:

> [t]he slave game devices execute in real time (play) concurrently a
> number of menu-selectable card and chance games, such as bingo,
> keno, poker, blackjack, and the like.

Col. 1, lines 50-53.

Itkis teaches that the slave devices are "intelligent (smart) game terminals comprising the microprocessor." Col. 2, lines 57-59. See also microprocessor 10 in Figure 2 of Itkis. Note that the Brief Description of the Drawings discloses that "FIG. 2 shows the hardware architecture of a game device incorporated into the game network." Col. 2, lines 32-33.

Thus, Itkis does not teach the claim 1 limitation of "a single processor configured to

- 8 -

access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal."

To the contrary, **Itkis teaches away** from the claim 1 limitation of "a single processor configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal."

Additionally, Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan fails to teach the claim 1 limitation "wherein the single processor transmits a communication signal to at least one switch, and wherein each switch selectively routes the communication signal to at least one of the plurality of gaming components."

Neither Vuong nor Stepan remedy the deficiency and teaching away in Itkis.

Similarly, Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan fails to teach the limitation of claim 7, as amended, of "a control module having a single processor for controlling the system and configured to execute software code, the software code configured to generate the first and second wagering events."

Additionally, Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan fails to teach the limitations of claim 7, as amended, of "two or more game terminals configured to concurrently present the wagering events generated by the single processor for controlling the system," and "wherein the single processor transmits a signal to the switch, and wherein the switch selectively routes the signal to at least one of the plurality of gaming components."

As mentioned above with regard to claim 1, Itkis teaches away from the above limitations.

Independent claim 15 has also been amended, and it is respectfully submitted that Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan fails to teach the limitations of claim 15, as amended. Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan fails to teach the limitations of "providing a single processor configured to read and execute game code stored on a memory," "executing the game code with the single processor to generate a first wagering event," and "executing the game code with the single processor to generate a second wagering event."

As mentioned above with regard to claim 1, Itkis teaches away from the above

limitations.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not rendered obvious by Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan , and are in condition for allowance

Information Disclosure Statement

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is being filed herewith. It is respectfully requested that this Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement be considered and the PTO Form 1449 be initialed and returned with the next Action.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of its allowance is solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application; the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Peter Mikhail/

Peter G. Mikhail
Reg. No. 46,930

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
510-663-1100